

REMARKS

This is in full and timely response to the Office Action mailed on May 16, 2007. Reexamination in light of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 23-29 are present in the above-identified application, with claim 23 being independent. *No new matter has been added.*

Reexamination in light of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Extensions of time

Please treat any concurrent or future reply, requiring a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, as incorporating a petition for extension of time for the appropriate length of time.

Rejoinder

The Restriction Requirement of September 1, 2006 asserts an existence of the following patentably distinct inventions:

- The Species of Figure(s) 4-5 versus that of Figure 6 versus Figures 7-9c v Figures 10 v 11 v 12a-13d v 14 v 15 v 16 v 17 v 18-19 v 20 v 21 v 22 v 23 v 24 v 25 v 28 v 29 v 30 v 31 v 32 v 33 v 38.

Page 2 of the Office Action of December 12, 2006 indicates that the restriction requirement mailed on September 1, 2006 has been made FINAL.

In response, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO) practice and procedures dictate that this linking claim must be examined with, and thus are considered part of, the invention elected. Specifically, M.P.E.P. §809 provides that when all claims directed to the elected invention are